

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 5, 7, 16 and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6 and 12-23 have been amended. Antecedent basis for the changes to the independent claims can be found in original claims 5, 7, 16 and 18, for example. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-15, 17 and 19-23 are pending and under consideration.

Claims 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner objects to the term "arrangement." This term has been replaced with --system--. With this change, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,926,816 to Bauer et al. Bauer et al. discloses a procedure for eliminating a conflict in a database set, which includes a database and a copy of the database. In Bauer et al., operations which can produce a conflict are allocated to defined conflict types, such as an insert conflict, an update conflict and a delete conflict. See Table I. Each conflict type is allocated to a decision. For example, for insert and delete conflicts, the catalog instructs the server to select either the client's operation or the server's operation, and to reject the other operation." See column 22, lines 38-40. With these decisions, the conflict produced by the operation can be eliminated. The decisions are shown in Table II, and the conflict resolution is described in column 22 of Bauer et al.

As amended, the independent claims contain limitations directed to a combination of decisions into decision sets and the allocation of decision sets to conflict types. Bauer et al. does not contain any suggestion of these features.

In Bauer et al., a direct allocation takes place of decisions to conflict types, namely by placing the allocations into a catalog. For example, as mentioned above, for discloses for insert and delete conflicts, the catalog instructs the server to select either the client's operation or the server's operation, and to reject the other operation. However, because the invention uses a decision set, it involves a more for reaching and more flexible approach. In the invention, operations which can produce a conflict are defined by conflict types. A decision set is in turn allocated to each conflict type. A conflict produced by an operation of the conflict type can be eliminated.

In addition to the above differences, the claims recite that a plurality of inconsistencies

are determined. The dependencies of these consistencies on one another is also determined. Then, while eliminating the inconsistency, the decision set is modified. There is no indication in Bauer et al. of a decision set. Hence, there is certainly no indication of altering a decision set based on dependencies of inconsistencies. Bauer et al. discloses only has a direct allocation of decisions to conflict types. Therefore, conflicts are not eliminated using decision sets, as claimed. Because there are no decision sets in Bauer et al., it would be impossible for there to be alternation of decision sets. Similarly, Bauer et al. does not determine mutual dependencies, which dependencies are used to alter the decision set. There are numerous and fundamental differences between the claimed invention and Bauer et al.

By using decision sets including a plurality of decisions (solution possibilities), it is possible to more completely determine the cause of the conflict and eliminate the conflict. This allows the system to have greater flexibility because the dependencies of the conflicts is considered. Because of the numerous and far reaching differences from Bauer et al., including greater adaptability provided through decision sets, claims 1, 12 and 23 patentably distinguish over the reference.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8-11, 13-15, 17 and 19-22 depend directly or indirectly on independent claim 1 or 12 and include all of the limitations of the respective independent claim and additional patentable limitations. For these reasons and for the reasons discussed above with regard to independent claims, the dependent claims are also in condition for allowability.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Oct. 3, 2003

By: Mark J. Henry
Mark J. Henry
Registration No. 36,162

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on Oct. 3, 2003
STAAS & HALSEY
By: Mark J. Henry
Date: 10.3.03